UNIVERSITY OF EAST ANGLIA
FACULTY OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

Welfare and Evaluation in Development
Module Outline

Section 1 – General Information	
Module Title Welfare and Evaluation in Development	
Module code DEV-7038A	**Credit value** 20 credits
Academic Year 2016/2017	**Semester** Autumn 2016
Related modules See other compulsory modules for the MSc in Impact Evaluation	

Contents

<table>
<tr><th colspan="2">Section 2 – Details of module</th></tr>
<tr><td>Description
What is this module about?</td><td>This module provides an introduction to the theory and practice of impact evaluation.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Learning Objectives

What will I learn? (subject specific and transferable skills)</td><td>The focus of the module will be on issues around evidence-based policy making, approaches to wellbeing, and their practical application in terms of evaluating the effect of development interventions on the quality of people's lives. The first part discusses the notion of evidence-based policy, introduces the students to the area of evaluation and reviews the role of programme theory in evaluation. The second part addresses the theory of welfare, with particular reference to poverty, inequality, and multi-dimensional ill-being as well as cost benefit and cost effectiveness analysis. The third part considers policy and evaluation in practice looking at a range of sectors and contexts.</td></tr>
<tr><td>Learning outcomes

What will I be able to do by the end of the module?</td><td>By the end of this course, students will have a deeper appreciation of the impact evaluation literature as well as an understanding of the discourses in impact evaluation more generally.
More precise learning outcomes:
Students will have gained an understanding of the complexities around policy processes and have learnt about history, theory and discourses in impact evaluation
Students will be able to critically engage with impact evaluations and assess their quality in particular with respect to the role of programme theory in evaluation
Students will be exposed to approaches to wellbeing and be able to identify key measurement challenges involved in the evaluation of development interventions
Students will be able to conduct simple cost-benefit and cost effectiveness analysis
Students will be able to identify the challenges of conducting impact evaluations in different contexts such as health, education and environment</td></tr>
<tr><td>Links

Where does this fit in to my programme?</td><td>The module is compulsory for the MSc in Impact Evaluation (MScIE) course. It is open for all students enrolled on a DEV Masters course.

Pre-requisites: An interest in impact evaluation</td></tr>
</table>

Section 3 – Teaching Team	
Module Convenor	Name: Maren Duvendack Contact details: m.duvendack@uea.ac.uk Office: ARTS 2.70
Others	Name: Edward Anderson Contact details: edward.anderson@uea.ac.uk Office: ARTS 2.75
	Name: Lucio Esposito Contact details: lucio.esposito@uea.ac.uk Office: ARTS 1.64
	Name: Bereket Kebede Contact details: b.kebede@uea.ac.uk Office: ARTS 1.77
	Name: Pieter Serneels Contact details: p.serneels@uea.ac.uk Office: ARTS 1.61

Section 4 – Expected Study Hours			
Activity	**Details**	**Total hours**	**% of credit**
Lectures	Lectures take place during weeks 2-12.	20 hrs	10%

Pre-lecture preparatory reading and post-lecture follow up reading	Do readings as assigned.	40 hrs	20%
Seminars	Four substantive sessions (three workshops and one computer lab session).	8 hrs	4%
Pre-seminar preparation and follow up study	The first assignment is based on workshop 1 which requires a group presentation and a workshop report. Students are strongly encouraged to read widely for workshop 1 in particular but for the other seminar and lab sessions as well.	24 hrs	12%
Formative assessment	Included as seminar 1	10 hrs	5%
Feedback sessions	On demand – office hours	4 hrs	2%
Assessed course work	Workshop report and essay (details in relevant section).	40 hrs	20%
Further reading and exam preparation	Revision for exams is students own responsibility. A revision lecture will be offered in April / May 2017 in order to provide limited guidance for exams.	52 hrs	26%
Exam	Examination attendance in April/May.*	2 hrs	1%
Total		200 hrs	100%

Note: *For students taking the MSc in Impact Evaluation (MScIE) only.

Section 5 – Teaching Sessions

Module Content and Structure

There is one lecture per week (2 hours each), one computer workshop (1.5 hours) and three seminars (between 1 and 2 hours each).

The module is structured around 3 themes:

1. Evidence-based policy making
2. Welfare, outcome measurement, cost benefit and cost effectiveness analysis
3. Policy and evaluation in practice

Timetable:

Lectures	Fridays 11.00-13.00	Weeks 2-5, 7-12
Computer Workshop	Tuesday 11.00-13.00	Week 11
Seminars	Tuesdays 11.00-13.00	Weeks 5, 9 and 12

Week	Lecture, workshop, seminar	By
2	Lecture 1. Evidence based policy: an introduction	MD
3	Lecture 2: Understanding the evaluation context	MD
4	Lecture 3. The role of programme theory in evaluation	MD
5	Lecture 4: Dealing with small n scenarios and complex interventions Seminar 1: The politics of evaluation	MD MD
6	**Reading Week**	
7	Lecture 5: Unidimensional poverty, inequality and wellbeing	LE

8	Lecture 6: Multidimensional poverty, inequality and wellbeing	LE
9	Lecture 7: Cost benefit analysis I: theory and key concepts Seminar 2: Weighing dimensions	EA LE
10	Lecture 8: Cost benefit analysis II: methods and applications	EA
11	Lecture 9: Evaluating health and education interventions using RCTs Computer workshop: Cost benefit and cost effectiveness analysis using Microsoft Excel	PS EA
12	Lecture 10: Valuing environmental services Seminar 3: Evaluating impact of environmental projects	BK BK
	Deadline Workshop report: Tuesday 8/11/2016, 03.00 p.m. *Deadline Essay: Monday 19/12/2016, 03.00 p.m.*	

Teaching Methods

Teaching methods include interactive lectures, group seminars, and project presentations and individual worked examples. The examples used will be drawn from the development literature and iconic IE case studies. The course will be taught by lecturers from the School of International Development with relevant expertise.

The lectures are there for an overview of and introduction to the topics the teaching team deem to be the most important aspects of Welfare and Evaluation in Development; the seminars and workshop for an in-depth exploration of a selection of these topics. The Coursework (see below under Assessment) is the key way for you to make the material covered in the module your own, and should direct and focus your efforts. Guidance on how to do so will be given throughout the module.

Lecture Programme – details for each lecture

Reading Lists by Lecture

The purpose of the readings lists by lecture is three-fold:

1. To help you prepare for the lectures. Readings that are particularly useful for preparing for a lecture are indicated with an *. If no readings are thus indicated, then browsing through a selection of your choice is recommended by the lecturer concerned.

2. To help you explore in greater depth particular themes covered in the lecture. Lecturers will during the lecture guide you towards the references on the reading list that belong to particular themes.

3. To provide you with an initial set of references on a number of themes that might feature in your coursework.

In short, the readings lists are there to help you get the most out of the lectures and facilitate you doing your coursework. It is NOT required that you read everything on them, nor should your reading be necessarily limited to the references given.

Readings with a * indicate essential key readings. Try and read at least one of them before the relevant lecture.

Lecture 1: Evidence-based policy making – an introduction

The first lecture provides an introduction to evidence-based policy making (EBPM), outlines the complexities around policy processes, discusses the role and use of evidence in EBPM, introduces different evaluation typologies and reviews the history and recent trends in evaluation.

Alkin, M. C., 2004. *Evaluation roots: Tracing theorists' views and influences.* Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Carden, F., 2009. *Knowledge to Policy: Making the most of Development Research*. New Delhi: Sage.

Donaldson, S. I., Christie, C. A., & Mark, M. M., (eds) 2009. *What Counts as Credible Evidence in Applied Research and Evaluation Practice?* Thousand Oaks: Sage. Retrieved from: http://sites.google.com/site/credibleevidence/Home

*Gertler, P. J., Martinez, S., Premand, P., Rawlings, L. B. & Vermeersch, C. M. J., 2011. *Impact Evaluation in Practice.* Washington D.C.: World Bank. – chapter 1

HM Treasury 2011. The Magenta Book: Guidance for evaluation. London: Her Majesty's Treasury. Retrieved from: http://www.hm-treasury.gov.uk/d/magenta_book_combined.pdf

Jones, H. et al., 2012. *Knowledge, Policy and Power in International Development: A Practical Guide.* Bristol: The Policy Press.

Khandker, S. R., Koolwal, G. B. & Samad, H. A., 2010. *Handbook on Impact Evaluation: Quantitative Methods and Practices.* Washington, D.C.: World Bank. - chapter 2

Monaghan, M., 2010. The Complexity of Evidence: Reflections on Research Utilisation in a Heavily Politicised Policy Area. *Social Policy and Society*, 9(01), pp.1-12.

*Monaghan, M., 2011. *Evidence Versus Politics: Exploiting Research in UK Drug Policy Making?* Bristol: The Policy Press. – also relevant for seminar 1.

*Nutley, S., Walter, I. & Davies, H., 2007. *Using Evidence: How Research can Inform Public Services*. Bristol: Policy Press.

ODI, Documents on Evidence Based Policymaking: http://www.odi.org.uk/rapid/Bibliographies/EBP/bibliography.html

Palfrey, C., Thomas, P. & Phillips, C., 2012. *Evaluation for the Real World: The Impact of Evidence in Policy Making.* Bristol: The Policy Press.

Pardey, P., & Smith, V., (eds) 2004. *What's Economics Worth? Valuing Policy Research*. Washington, D.C.: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Pawson, R., 2006. *Evidence-based Policy: A Realist Perspective.* London: Sage.

Pawson, R., & Tilley, N., 1997. *Realistic Evaluation*. London: Sage.

*Ravallion, M. (2008) Evaluation in the Practice of Development. World Bank Policy Research Working Paper Series. Retrieved from: *http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1103727*.

*Rossi, P.H., Lipsey, M.W. & Freeman, H.E., 2004. *Evaluation: A Systematic Approach (7th edn.).* Thousand Oaks: Sage. – chapter 1

Savedoff, W. D., Levine, R., & Birdsall, N., 2006. When Will We ever Learn? Improving Lives through Impact Evaluation. Washington D.C.: Centre for Global Development. Retrieved from: http://www.cgdev.org/files/7973_file_WillWeEverLearn.pdf

Spiel, C. & Strohmeier, D., 2012. Evidence-based Practice and Policy : When Researchers, Policy makers, and Practitioners Learn How to Work Together. *European Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 9(1), pp.150-162.

Sutcliffe, S. & Court, J., 2005. Evidence-based Policymaking: What is it? How does it work? What relevance for developing contries? London: Overseas Development Institute. Retrieved from: http://www.odi.org.uk/resources/docs/3683.pdf

Recent trends:

Duflo, E., Glennerster, R. & Kremer, M., 2007. Using Randomization in Development Economics Research: A Toolkit. Centre for Economic Policy Research, Discussion Paper No. 6059, January.

Haynes, L., O. Service, B. Goldacre & Torgerson, D., 2012. Test, Learn, Adapt: Developing Public Policy with Randomised Controlled Trials. London: Cabinet Office.

Scrivens, N. M., 2008. A Summative Evaluation of RCT Methodology: An Alternative Approach to Causal Research. *Journal of Multidisciplinary Evaluation*, *5*(9), 11-24.

Stern, E., N. Stame, J. Mayne, K. Forss, R. Davies and B. Befani. 2012. Broadening the range of designs and methods for impact evaluations. Working Paper No. 38, Department for International Development, UK.

Discussion - What do we know about the impact of microfinance?

Duvendack, M. & Palmer-Jones, R., 2012. High Noon for Microfinance Impact Evaluations: Re-investigating the Evidence from Bangladesh. Forthcoming in the *Journal of Development Studies*.

Duvendack, M., Palmer-Jones, R., Copestake, J. G., Hooper, L., Loke, Y., & Rao, N., 2011. “What is the Evidence of the Impact of Microfinance on the Well-being of Poor People?” London: EPPI-Centre, Social Science Research Unit, Institute of Education, University of London.

Lecture 2: Understanding the evaluation context

The second lecture sets out the difference between monitoring & evaluation and impact evaluation, reviews the purpose of evaluations, introduces the evaluation problems evaluators are commonly faced with, discusses classic issues in evaluation, outlines the components and determinants of good evaluation questions and talks about what we should be evaluating.

*Bamberger, M., Rugh, J. & Mabry, L., 2006. *RealWorld Evaluation: Working Under Budget, Time, Data, and Political Constraints.* Thousand Oaks: Sage. – chapter 1 & 2

*Gertler, P. J., Martinez, S., Premand, P., Rawlings, L. B. & Vermeersch, C. M. J., 2011. *Impact Evaluation in Practice.* Washington D.C.: World Bank. – chapter 1 - 3

*HM Treasury 2011. The Magenta Book: Guidance for evaluation. London: Her Majesty’s Treasury. Retrieved from: http://www.hm-treasury.gov.uk/d/magenta_book_combined.pdf

*Khandker, S. R., Koolwal, G. B. & Samad, H. A., 2010. *Handbook on Impact Evaluation: Quantitative Methods and Practices.* Washington, D.C.: World Bank. - chapter 2

Pearl, J., 2000. *Causality: Models, Reasoning, and Inference*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Perrin, B., 2012. Linking Monitoring and Evaluation to Impact Evaluation. *Impact Evaluation Notes, No. 2*. Retrieved from: http://www.interaction.org/sites/default/files/Linking Monitoring and Evaluation to Impact Evaluation.pdf.

Ravallion, M., 1999. The Mystery of the Vanishing Benefits: Ms. Speedy Analyst's Introduction to Evaluation. The World Bank, Policy Research Working Paper No. 2153, July. (published as: Ravallion, M., 2001. The Mystery of the Vanishing Benefits: An Introduction to Impact Evaluation. *The World Bank Economic Review*, 15 (1), pp.115-140.)

*Ravallion, M. (2008) Evaluation in the Practice of Development. World Bank Policy Research Working Paper Series. Retrieved from: *http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=1103727*.

*Rossi, P.H., Lipsey, M.W. & Freeman, H.E., 2004. *Evaluation: A Systematic Approach (7th edn.).* Thousand Oaks: Sage. – chapter 2 & 3

Ton, G., 2012. The mixing of methods: A three-step process for improving rigour in impact evaluations. *Evaluation*, 18(1), pp.5-25.

Lecture 3: The role of programme theory in evaluation

Evaluations are based on programme theory which sets out the causes and consequences of social problems on which specific interventions are based. This lecture discusses the effective use of theories of change and logic models in planning and developing evaluations.

*Bamberger, M., Rugh, J. & Mabry, L., 2006. *RealWorld Evaluation: Working Under Budget, Time, Data, and Political Constraints.* Thousand Oaks: Sage. – chapter 2 & 9

Chen, H., 1994. Theory-driven Evaluations: Need, Difficulties, and Options. *Evaluation Practice*, 15(1), pp.79-82.

Chen, H. & Rossi, P., 1989. Issues in the Theory-driven Perspective, *Evaluation and Program Planning* (12)4, pp.299–306.

Donaldson, S., 2007. *Program Theory-Driven Evaluation Science: Strategies and Applications*. Thousands Oaks: Sage.

*Funnell, S., & Rogers, P., 2011. *Purposeful Program Theory: Effective Use of Theories of Change and Logic Models.* San Francisco: Wiley & Sons.

*Pawson, R., 2003. Nothing as Practical as a Good Theory. *Evaluation*, 9(4), pp.471-490.

Pawson, R., & Tilley, N., 1997. *Realistic Evaluation*. London: Sage.

Rossi, P.H., Lipsey, M.W. & Freeman, H.E., 2004. *Evaluation: A Systematic Approach (7th edn.).* Thousand Oaks: Sage. – chapter 5

*Weiss, C., 2001. Theory-based Evaluation: Theories of Change for Poverty Based Programs. In O. Feinstein & R. Picciotto, eds. *Evaluation and Poverty Reduction*. Brunswick: Transaction. Retrieved from: http://books.google.co.uk/books?id=iQhwMSdtOa4C&printsec=frontcover#v=onepage&q&f=false

*White, H., 2009. Theory-Based Impact Evaluation: Principles and Practice. *3ie Working Paper No. 3*.

Examples:

*Carvalho S. & White H., 2004. Theory-based Evaluation: The Case of Social Funds. *American Journal of Evaluation.* 25(2), pp.141–60.

*White, H. & Masset, E., 2007. Assessing Interventions to Improve Child Nutrition: A Theory-based Impact Evaluation of the Bangladesh Integrated Nutrition Project. *Journal of International Development*, 19, pp.627-652.

Lecture 4: Dealing with small n scenarios and complex interventions

In this lecture we focus on dealing with small n scenarios and complex interventions, we first rehearse the challenges of conducting evaluations in these contexts, discuss some popular approaches commonly employed such as theory-based, case-based and participatory approaches and identify principles to successfully employing these approaches.

Eoyang G. & Berkas,T., (1998). Evaluation in a Complex Adaptive System. Retrieved from: http://www.hsdinstitute.org/learn-more/library/articles/Evaluating-Performance-in-a-CAS.pdf

Forss, K, Marra, M. & Schwarz, R., (eds), 2011. *Evaluating the Complex: Attribution, Contribution, and Beyond*. New Jersey: Transaction Press.

Fujita, N., (ed), 2010. *Beyond Logframe; Using Systems Concepts in Evaluation*, Tokyo: FASID. Retrieved from: http://www.fasid.or.jp/shuppan/hokokusho/pdf/h21-3.pdf

Funnell, S., & Rogers, P., 2011. *Purposeful Program Theory: Effective Use of Theories of Change and Logic Models.* San Francisco: Wiley & Sons.

Gertler, P. J., Martinez, S., Premand, P., Rawlings, L. B. & Vermeersch, C. M. J., 2011. *Impact Evaluation in Practice.* Washington D.C.: World Bank. – chapter 9

Glouberman, S. & Zimmerman, B., 2002. Complicated and Complex Systems: What Would Successful Reform of Medicare Look Like? Ottawa: Commission on the

Future of Health Care in Canada. Retrieved from: http://www.plexusinstitute.org/resource/collection/6528ED29-9907-4BC7-8D00-8DC907679FED/ComplicatedAndComplexSystems-ZimmermanReport_Medicare_reform.pdf

HM Treasury 2011. The Magenta Book: Guidance for evaluation. London: Her Majesty's Treasury. Retrieved from: http://www.hm-treasury.gov.uk/d/magenta_book_combined.pdf

Hummelbrunner, R., 2011. Systems Thinking and Evaluation. *Evaluation*, 17(4), pp.395-403.

Kurtz, C. F., and Snowden, D. F., 2003. The New Dynamics of Strategy: Sense-Making in a Complex and Complicated World." *IBM Systems Journal*, 42(3), pp.462–483. Retrieved from: http://alumni.media.mit.edu/~brooks/storybiz/kurtz.pdf

Ling, T., 2012. Evaluating Complex and Unfolding Interventions in Real Time. *Evaluation*, 18(1), pp.79-91.

*Oakley, A. et al., 2006. Process Evaluation in Randomised Controlled Trials of Complex Interventions. *British Medical Journal*, 332, pp.413-416.

*Patton, M. Q. 2011. *Developmental Evaluation: Applying Complexity Concepts to Enhance Innovation and Use.* New York: Guildford Press.

*Ramalingam, B. and Jones, H., 2008. Exploring the Science of Complexity: Ideas and Implications for Development and Humanitarian Efforts. *ODI Working Paper No. 285*. Retrieved from: http://www.odi.org.uk/resources/docs/833.pdf

*Rogers, P.J., 2008. Using Programme Theory to Evaluate Complicated and Complex Aspects of Interventions. *Evaluation*, 14(1), pp.29-48.

Rogers, P., 2009. Matching Impact Evaluation Design to the Nature of the Intervention and the Purpose of the Evaluation. *Journal of Development Effectiveness*, 1(3), pp.217-226.

Snowden, D. J. & Boone, M., 2007. A Leader's Framework for Decision Making. *Harvard Business Review*, pp.1-9.

Stame, N., 2004. Theory-Based Evaluation and Types of Complexity. *Evaluation*, 10(1), pp.58-76.

*Stern, E., N. Stame, J. Mayne, K. Forss, R. Davies and B. Befani. 2012. Broadening the range of designs and methods for impact evaluations. *Working paper no. 38*, Department for International Development, UK.

Williams, B and Hummelbrunner, R., 2010. *Systems Concepts In Action: A Practitioner's Toolkit.* Stanford: Stanford University Press.

*White, H. & Phillips, D., 2012. Adressing Attribution of Cause and Effect in Small n Impact Evaluations: Towards an Integrated Framework. *3ie Working Paper No. 15*. Retrieved from: http://www.3ieimpact.org/media/filer/2012/06/29/working_paper_15.pdf.

Lecture 5: Unidimensional poverty, inequality and wellbeing

In this lecture students will be introduced to the concepts of inequality, wellbeing, absolute and relative poverty in a unidimensional setting (i.e. when only one domain of people's achievement is considered, for example income). An understanding of the normative foundations of these concepts will lead to the discussion of the desirable properties for indices to be used in empirical evaluation.

Balsa, A. I., French, M. T., & Regan, T. L. (2014). Relative deprivation and risky behaviors. *Journal of Human Resources*, 49(2), 446-471.

Bosmans K, K Decancq and A Decoster, 2014. The relativity of decreasing inequality between countries. *Economica,* 81, 276–292.

Bossert, W., D'Ambrosio, C. and V. Peragine (2007). Deprivation and Social Exclusion. *Economica*, 777-803.

*Clark, A.E., Frijters, P. and M. A. Shields (2008), Relative Income, Happiness, and Utility: An Explanation for the Easterlin Paradox and Other Puzzles, *Journal of Economic Literature*, 46 (1), 95-144

Corazzini, L., Esposito, L. and Majorano F. (2011), Exploring the Absolutist Vs Relativist Perception of Poverty Using a Cross-Country Questionnaire Survey. *Journal of Economic Psychology* , 32, 273-283

Corazzini, L., Esposito, L. and F. Majorano (2011). Reign in Hell or Serve in Heav'n? A Cross-country Journey into the Absolutist vs. Relativist Perception of Wellbeing, *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization*, 81, 715-730.

Easterlin, R. A. and Angelescu L. (2009), Happiness and Growth the World Over: Time Series Evidence on the Happiness-Income Paradox, IZA Discussion Paper No. 4060

http://ftp.iza.org/dp4060.pdf

Esposito, L. and Lambert, P. J. (2011) Poverty Measurement: Prioritarianism, Sufficiency and the 'I's of Poverty. *Economics and Philosophy,* 27, 109-121

Esposito, L., 2010. Upper Boundedness for the Measurement of Relative Deprivation. *Review of Income and Wealth*, 56, 632–639

Foster, J., J. Greer, and E. Thorbecke (1984), 'A Class of Decomposable Poverty Measures,' *Econometrica* 52, 761-65.

Foster, J. E. (1998), 'Absolute versus Relative Poverty,' *American Economic Review*, Papers and Proceedings, 88: 335-41.

Hirschman A.O. and M. Rothschild (1973). The Changing Tolerance for Income Inequality in the Course of Economic Development. *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 87, pp. 544-566.

Luttmer, E. (2005), Neighbours as negatives: Relative earnings and wellbeing. *Quarterly Journal of Economics,* 120, pp. 963-1002

Milanovic, B. (2009), Global inequality recalculated: The effect of new 2005 PPP estimates on global inequality, MPRA Paper No. 16538

http://mpra.ub.uni-muenchen.de/16538/1/MPRA_paper_16538.pdf

Quon, E. C., & McGrath, J. J. (2014). Subjective socioeconomic status and adolescent health: A meta-analysis. *Health Psychology*, 33(5), 433.

Ray, D. (1998), *Development Economics*, Oxford University Press. Chapter 8.

Sen, A. K. (1983), Poor, relatively speaking, *Oxford Economic Papers*, 2, 153-169, 1983

Yitzhaki, S. (1979). Relative Deprivation and the Gini Coefficient, *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 93, 321-324.

<u>Lecture 6: Multidimensional poverty, inequality and wellbeing</u>

This lecture is about the multidimensional approach to poverty, inequality and wellbeing. Students will be presented with the rationale for abandoning a unidimensional approach and adopt a multidimensional stance. They will be able to recognise the main challenges in developing and applying multidimensional indicators. The lecture will also look at the recent developments in the evaluation of intertemporal poverty and wellbeing.

*Alkire, S. (2002), Dimensions of Human Development, *World Development*, 30 (2), 181-205

Alkire, S. and J. E. Foster (2011). Counting and Multidimensional Poverty Measurement. *Journal of Public Economics*, 95, (7-8), 476-487..

Alkire, S. and Santos M. E. (2010), Multidimensional Poverty Index, OPHI Research Brief http://www.ophi.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/OPHI-MPI-Brief.pdf

Bossert, W., Chakravarty, S. and D'Ambrosio, C. (2008), Poverty and Time, ECINEQ WP 2008-87

*Bourguignon, Francois, and Satya R. Chakravarty (2003), The measurement of multidimensional poverty, Journal of Economic Inequality 1: 25-49.

D'Ambrosio, C. and Rodrigues, R. I. (2008), Deprivation in the Sa˜o Paulo Districts: Evidence from 2000, *World Development*, Vol. 36, No. 6, pp. 1094–1112

Duclos, J.-Y. and P. Grégoire (2002). Absolute and relative deprivation and the measurement of poverty. *Review of Income and Wealth*, 4, 471-492.

Hoy, M. and B. Zheng (2011), Measuring lifetime poverty. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 146, 2544-2562.

Kakwani, N. and J. Silber (2008). Introduction: Multidimensional Poverty Analysis: Conceptual Issues, Empirical Illustrations and Policy Implications. *World Development*, 36, 987-991.

Michener, G. (2015). Policy Evaluation via Composite Indexes: Qualitative Lessons from International Transparency Policy Indexes. *World Development*, 74, 184-196.

* Ravallion, Martin (2011). On multidimensional indices of poverty. *Journal of Economic Inequality*, 9 (2): 235-248.

Ravallion, M. (2012). Troubling tradeoffs in the Human Development Index. *Journal of Development Economics*, 99(2), 201 – 209.

Tsui, Kai Y, (2002). Multidimensional poverty indices. *Social Choice and Welfare*, 19: 69-93.

Vasquez, A., Cabieses, B., & Tunstall, H. (2016). Where Are Socioeconomically Deprived Immigrants Located in Chile? A Spatial Analysis of Census Data Using an Index of Multiple Deprivation from the Last Three Decades (1992-2012). *PloS one*, 11(1), e0146047.

Lecture 7: Cost benefit analysis I: theory and concepts

In this lecture students will learn about cost-benefit analysis – the main tool that economics provides for analysing problems of social choice, e.g. should Brazil build a new airport, or India a new steel mill. They will learn about purpose of cost benefit analysis (CBA), its theoretical and conceptual underpinnings, and the difference between CBA and cost effectiveness analysis (CEA).

*Students should read at least one reading marked with a * before the lecture*

*Boardman, A. et al. (2011). Cost Benefit Analysis: Concepts and Practice. London: Prentice Hall, 4th edition. Chapters 1-2.

Connolly, S. and Munro, A. (1999). Economics of the Public Sector. London: Prentice Hall Europe. Chapter 7 (Cost benefit analysis).

Dinwiddy, C. and Teal, F. (1996). Principles of Cost-benefit Analysis for Developing Countries. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

*Hausman, D. and McPherson, M. (2006). *Economic Analysis, Moral Philosophy, and Public Policy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Chapter 9 (Efficiency).

Kirkpatrick, C. and Weiss, J. (1996). Cost-benefit Analysis and Project Appraisal in Developing Countries. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.

*Layard, R. and Glaister, S. (eds) (1994). Cost Benefit Analysis. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. Chapter 1 (Introduction).

Mishan, E. and Quah, E. (2007). Cost-benefit Analysis. London: Routledge, 5th edition.

*Sen, A. (2000). The discipline of cost-benefit analysis. Journal of Legal Studies 29 (S2): 931-952.

Stiglitz, J. (2000). Economics of the Public Sector. New York: WW Norton and Co, 3rd Edition. Chapter 11 (Cost benefit analysis).

Lecture 8: Cost benefit analysis II: methods and applications

In this lecture students will learn more about certain key issues faced when applying CBA and CEA in practice, such as discounting, risk and uncertainty, and the different approaches used for valuing the costs and benefits of development projects and policy interventions. They will also get to examine and discuss examples of the use of CBA and CEA in practice.

*Students should read at least one reading marked with a * before the lecture*

Belli, P. et al (2001). Economic Analysis of Investment Operations: Analytical Tools and Practical Applications. Washington D.C.: World Bank.

Boardman, A. et al. (2011). Cost Benefit Analysis: Concepts and Practice. London: Prentice Hall, 4th edition. Chapters 12-15.

Handa, S. (2002). Raising primary school enrolment in developing countries: the relative importance of supply and demand. *Journal of Development Economics* 69: 103-128.

*Hutton, G., Haller, L. and Bartram, J. (2007). Global cost-benefit analysis of water supply and sanitation interventions. *Journal of Water and Health* 05.4: 481-502.

Stern, N. (1972). Experience with the Little-Mirrless method for an appraisal of smallholder tea in Kenya. Bulletin of the Oxford University Institute of Economics and Statistics, 34 (1): 93-123.

*Jeuland, M., Lucas, M., Clemens, J. and Whittington, D. (2009). A cost-benefit analysis of cholera vaccination programs in Beira, Mozambique. *World Bank Economic Review* 23 (2): 235-267.

*Uneze, E., Tajudeen, I. and Iweala, O. (2012). Cost-effectiveness and benefit-cost analysis of some water interventions in Nigeria: the case of Bauchi State. *Journal of Development Effectiveness* 4 (4): 497-514.

*Whittington, D., Lauria, D., Prabhu, V. and Cook, J. (2004). An economic reappraisal of the Melamchi water supply project – Kathmandu, Nepal. *Portuguese Journal of Economics* 3: 157-178.

Lecture 9: Evaluating health and education service delivery

This lecture will discuss the evaluation of health and education interventions, making use of concrete examples from these sectors.

Here are some key readings – more references will be provided closer to and during the lecture

Education:

Bruns B., D. Filmer, H.A. Patrinos, 2011, Making Schools Work, World Bank

Kremer M., A. Holla, 2008, Improving Education in the Developing World: What Have we Learned From Randomized Interventions?

McEwan P.J., Improving Learning in Primary Schools of Developing Countries: A Meta-Analysis of Randomized Experiments, Wellesley College July 2014

Murnane R.J., A.J.Ganimian, 2014, Improving Educational Outcomes in Developing Countries: Lessons from Rigorous Evaluations, NBER Working Paper 20284

Health:

Bjorkman M. and Jakob Svensson. Power to the people: Evidence from a randomized field experiment on community-based monitoring in Uganda. Quarterly Journal of Economics, 124(2):735–769, May 2009.

Banerjee A., E.Duflo, 2009, Improving Health Care Delivery in India, MIT Working Paper , see http://econ-www.mit.edu/files/5172

Collier P., S. Dercon, J. Mackinnon, 2003, “Density versus Quality in Social Sector Provision: The Use of Household Data for Budgetary Choices in Ethiopia”, World Bank Economic Review, pp.425-448

Dupas P., Short-Run Subsidies and Long-Run Adoption of New Health Products: Evidence from a Field Experiment, see http://www.stanford.edu/~pdupas/Subsidies&Adoption.pdf

Gertler P. J., Boyce S., 2001, An Experiment in Incentive-Based Welfare: The Impact of PROGESA on Health in Mexico, see http://repec.org/res2003/Gertler.pdf

In favour of RCTs:

Banerjee A.B., E. Duflo, 2009, The Experimental Approach to Development Economics, Annual Review of Economics, 2009, 1, 151–78

Duflo, E., R. Glennerster, and M. Kremer, 2008, Using Randomization in Development Economics Research: A Toolkit. In Handbook of Development Economics, T. P. Schultz, and J. Strauss, eds., 3895–3962 Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Imbens G.W., 2009, Better LATE Than Nothing: Some Comments on Deaton (2009) and Heckman and Urzua

Leamer, Edward E. 1983. Let's Take the Con Out Of Econometrics. American Economic Review 73(1): 31–43.

Intelligent criticisms of RCTs:

Basu, Kaushik. 2005. The New Empirical Development Economics: Remarks on Its Philosophical Foundations. Economic and Political Weekly XL (40): 4336–4339

Barrett C.B., M. R. Carter, The Power and Pitfalls of Experiments in Development Economics: Some Non-random Reflections, 2010, Applied Economic Perspectives and Policy, Vol 32, number 4, pp. 515–548

Deaton, Angus. 2010. Instruments, Randomization, and Learning About Development. Journal of Economic Literature 48(2): 424–455

Ravallion, Martin. 2009. Should the Randomistas Rule? BE Press Economists' Voice

Rodrik, Dani. 2009. The New Development Economics: We Shall Experiment, but How Shall We Learn? In What Works in Development: Thinking Big and Thinking Small. Jessica Cohen, and William Easterly, eds. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press.

Bed time reading:

Banerjee A.V, E. Duflo, 2011, Poor Economics. A Radical Rethinking of The Way To Fight Global Poverty, Dutton, Penguin Group, New York

Kaplan D., J. Appel, 2011, More Than Good Intentions. How A New Economics is Helping To Solve Global Poverty, Public Affairs, New York

Other sources:

JPAL, IPA, 3ie

<u>Lecture 10: Valuing environmental services</u>

Since markets for most environmental services are absent valuing environmental services and impacts is inherently complex. This lecture will discuss the different methods developed to evaluate environmental services.

HANLEY, N., and C. L. SPASH (1993): *Cost-Benefit Analysis and the Environment*. Aldershot: Edward Elgar.

DUFLO, E., and R. PANDE (2007): "Dams," *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 122, 601-646.

Fisher, Brendan; Ian Bateman and R. Kerry Turner**.** 2011. "Valuing Ecosystem Services: Benefits, Values, Space and Time," Nairobi, Kenya: The United Nations Environment Programme,

GILLESPIE, T., E. FRANKENBERG, M. BRAUGHTON, A. M. COOKE, T. ARMENTA, and D. THOMAS (2009): "Assessment of Natural Hazard Damage and Reconstruction: A Case Study from Band Aceh, Indonesia," Los Angeles: California Center for Population Research, UC.

Liu, Shuang; Robert Costanza; Stephen Farber and Austin Troy. 2010. "Valuing Ecosystem Services: Theory, Practice, and the Need for a Transdisciplinary Synthesis." *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 1185, 54-78.

Lv, Yao; Shu-zhong Gu and Dong-mei Guo**.** 2010. "Valuing Environmental Externalities from Rice–Wheat Farming in the Lower Reaches of the Yangtze River." *Ecological Economics*, 69 1436-42.

MARKANDYA, A., and M. N. MURTY (2004): "Cost-Benefit Analysis of Cleaning the Ganges: Some Emerging Environment and Development Issues," *Environment and Development Economics*, 9, 61-81.

Morgan, R. K. (2012). Environmental impact assessment: the state of the art. *Impact Assessment and Project Appraisal,* 30(1), 5-14.

O'Faircheallaigh, C. (2010). Public participation and environmental impact assessment: Purposes, implications, and lessons for public policy making. *Environmental Impact Assessment Review,* 30 19-27.

STERN, N. (2008): "The Economics of Climate Change," *American Economic Review*, 98, 1-37.

Seminar Programme – details for each session

Computer Workshop and Seminars

When this is indicated below or during a preceding lecture, students are expected to read in preparation for the seminars. The remarks made about the readings lists above apply here as well.

Seminar 1: The politics of evaluation

Evaluations can never be absolutely value-free and objective; politics and values inevitably play a role during the evaluation process. A recent example in this context is the debate over the promotion of quantitative approaches, notably randomized experiments, in EBPM as the gold standard. In this seminar students are expected prepare a group presentation for which they have to develop a case study that engages with the political issues that might arise at different stages in the evaluation process and discusses how evaluators might respond to these (Bamberger et al, 2006 listed below is a good starting point, chapter 6 can also be found on the Blackboard site). The group presentation will form the basis of an assessed seminar report each student has to submit – see section 8. for more details and deadlines.

Readings

*Bamberger, M., Rugh, J. & Mabry, L., 2006. *RealWorld Evaluation: Working Under Budget, Time, Data, and Political Constraints.* Thousand Oaks: Sage. – chapter 6

Best, J., 2001. *Damned Lies and Statistics: Untangling Numbers from the Media, Politicians and Activists.* Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Contandriopoulos, D. & Brousselle, A., 2012. Evaluation Models and Evaluation Use. *Evaluation*, 18(1), pp.61-77.

*Datta, L., 2011. Politics and Evaluation: More Than Methodology. *American Journal of Evaluation*, 32(2), pp.273-294.

Feinstein, O.N., 2002. Use of Evaluations and the Evaluation of their Use. *Evaluation*, 8(4), pp.433-439.

Karlsson, O., 1996. A Critical Dialogue in Evaluation: How can Interaction between Evaluation and Politics be Tackled? *Evaluation*, 2, pp.405-416.

Pawson, R., & Tilley, N., 1997. *Realistic Evaluation*. London: Sage.

Picciotto, R., 2011. The Logic of Evaluation Professionalism. *Evaluation*, 17(2), pp.165-180.

Prichett, L. (2003). It pays to be ignorant: a Simple Political Economy of Rigorous Program Evaluation. *Policy Reform*, *5*(4), pp.251-269.

Rossi, P.H., Lipsey, M.W. & Freeman, H.E., 2004. *Evaluation: A Systematic Approach (7th edn.).* Thousand Oaks: Sage. – chapter 2

*Taylor, D. & Balloch, S., 2005. *The Politics of Evaluation: Participation and Policy Implementation*. Bristol: Policy Press.

Yarbrough, D. B., Shulha, L. M., Hopson, R. K. & Caruther, F. A., 2011 The Program Evaluation Standards: A Guide for Evaluators and Evaluation Users. 3rd ed. Thousand Oaks: Sage. Retrieved from: http://books.google.co.uk/books?id=wRStsdIXYSsC&pg=PR5&source=gbs_selected_pages&cad=3#v=onepage&q&f=false

Example – Experiments in evaluation:

Also see the references provided for lecture 1 under "recent trends", there is much more on this of course.

Bamberger, M. & White, H., 2007. Using Strong Evaluation Designs in Developing Countries: Experience and Challenges. Journal of MultiDisciplinary Evaluation, 4(8), pp.58-73.

*House, E., 2004. Democracy and Evaluation. Paper presented to the European Evaluation Society. Retrieved from: http://www.informat.org/pdfs/house.pdf.

*Picciotto, R., 2012. Experimentalism and Development Evaluation: Will the Bubble Burst? *Evaluation*, 18(2), pp.213-229.

*Ravallion, M., 2009. Should the Randomistas Rule? *The Economists' Voice*, 6(2).

Seminar 2: Weighing dimensions

In this seminar students will gain an in depth understanding of the issue of weighing components in multidimensional and intertemporal evaluation. During the seminar a variety of techniques for eliciting weights and dimensions importance scores will be discussed. Further, the implications for assessing poverty, inequality and wellbeing will be explored.

Readings

Broome, J. (1991), *Weighing Goods*, Wiley-Blackwell

Broome, J. (2004), *Weighing lives*, Oxford University Press

*Decancq, K. and Lugo, M.A. (2013) Weights in Multidimensional Indices of W-Being: An Overview, *Econometric Reviews,* 32(1), 7-34.

http://www.econ.kuleuven.be/public/ndaaf78/Decancq%20and%20Lugo%202010.pdf

*Esposito, L. and Chiappero-Martinetti, E., 2010. Multidimensional Poverty Measurement: Restricted and Unrestricted Hierarchy among Poverty Dimensions. *Journal of*

Applied Economics 13 (2) pp. 181-204

Seminar 3: Evaluating impact of environmental projects

In this seminar students discuss alternative impact evaluation methods and the debate surrounding the evaluation of environment in general. The following two papers will be used to lead the discussions in the seminar.

*Ferraro, P. J. "Counterfactual Thinking and Impact Evaluation in Environmental Policy." *New Directions for Evaluation* 122, Special issue (2009): 75-84.

*Margoluis, R., C. Stem, N. Salafsky, and M. Brown. "Design Alternatives for Evaluating the Impact of Conservation Projects." *New Directions for Evaluation* 122 (2009): 85-96.

Computer workshop: Cost benefit and cost effectiveness analysis using Microsoft Excel

In the computer workshop students will learn how to use Microsoft Excel to carry out CBA and CEA in practice. They will learn how to use discounted cash flow analysis, how to calculate internal rates of return, and how to do sensitivity analysis. Students will also be given further opportunities to discuss and identify the potential pitfalls with CBA and CEA in practice.

Other Taught Sessions Programme – workshops, practicals, fieldwork, placements, drop-in sessions

NA

Section 6 – Study materials	
Required Reading	As indicated in the reading lists above which could supplemented with further readings as appropriate.
Recommended further reading	NA
Other study materials	NA

Section 7 – Formative Assessment			
Assessment Type	**Assignment Deadline**	**Return date of marked work (where appropriate)**	**Nature of feedback**

Formative 1	Week 5 during seminar 1	NA	Oral feedback during seminar 1
Assignment detail (e.g. title, type, course test length, word limit, presentation length)			
The formative assessment is a group presentation that students are asked to prepare for seminar 1. Students will prepare a case study that engages with the political issues that typically arise in the evaluation cycle – see page 19 for further details. Students are asked to form groups (sign-up sheet outside Arts 2.70 after lecture 1). The group presentations will then form the basis for a seminar report (see below 'coursework 1' for details) that each student will have to submit individually. The oral feedback given during seminar 1 after each presentation will help the students to write their individual seminar reports where the seminar learnings and discussions will be summarised and reflected on.			

Section 8a – Summative Assessment							
Assessment Type and Sequence No.	**(%) counting towards overall module mark**	**Assign-ment Deadline**	**Method of Sub-mission**	**If electronic sub-mission, can colour be used?**	**Return Date of Marked Work**	**Method of Return**	**Nature of feedback**
Coursework 1 Seminar report	30%	8th November 2016, 03.00pm.	Written	Yes	3 weeks after obtaining scripts from teaching hub	Electronic feedback	Written

Assignment detail (e.g. title, type, word limit, presentation length)

Each student will submit a seminar report that is based on the group presentation given in seminar 1. This report should

- review the issues addressed in their group presentation,
- summarise what they have learnt from this exercise and
- critically reflect on the issues that were discussed in the seminar.

The seminar report should be no more than 1,000 words (excluding bibliography and tables/diagrams).

A UEA policy of anonymous marking was introduced in September 2008, where practicable, for all coursework. Coursework that might not be anonymous, at the School's discretion, includes seminar presentations.

Word count penalty:

Up to 10% over the word limit - no penalty

10% or more over the word limit – a penalty will be applied.

See https://www.uea.ac.uk/learningandteaching/getting-started/handbooks for detailed information.

All assessed work should be typed, contain full bibliographic references and a word count. Students are required to keep electronic copies of all assignments for the duration of their degree.

Students must keep original coursework with comments attached and the electronic versions of all work submitted for the duration of their period of study. This is because if plagiarism is suspected, students may be asked to re-submit the electronic version of their coursework (including previous years) for screening. Failure to provide the electronic version could result in a mark of zero.

Failure to attend a seminar where you are one of the presenters will result in a mark of zero for the seminar presentation.

Assessment Type and Sequence No.	(%) counting towards overall module mark	Assignment Deadline	Method of Sub-mission	If electronic sub-mission, can colour be used?	Return Date of Marked Work	Method of Return
Coursework 2 Essay	70%	19th December 2016, 03.00pm.	Written	Yes	3 weeks after obtaining scripts from teaching hub	Electronic feedback

Assignment detail (e.g. title, type, word limit, presentation length)

Essay

Select one of the following essay topics:

1. Evaluators are often faced with complex interventions where large 'n' impact evaluations involving tests of statistical significance are often not appropriate. Hence small 'n' evaluation approaches have risen in popularity. Please discuss under what circumstances it would be advisable to use or not to use small 'n' approaches. Use case studies to illustrate your arguments.

2. A development project/programme may bring about an increase in the difference between haves and have-nots in the village or region. Should this impact be measured using indices of inequality or indices of relative deprivation?

3. With reference to a specific development project or policy reform, critically examine the methods used in cost benefit analysis (CBA) to value the costs and benefits of the project or reform.*

4. Contingent valuation method (CVM) is one of the most widely used approaches to value environmental resources. Discuss CVM. In addition, critically review some case studies that use CVM from the empirical literature.

The essay should be a maximum of 2,500 words in length (excluding bibliography and tables/diagrams).

*Your answer to this question should be based on an actual cost benefit analysis (not a cost effectiveness analysis), documented in a publicly-available journal article or official report written in English. For the critical assessment it should also draw on the wider CBA literature. It should provide some background information about the project or reform, an overview of the valuation method(s) used, and an assessment of how well those methods were applied, and their potential biases or limitations. Please consult with the relevant lecturer (Edward Anderson) to make sure that your choice of project or policy reform is suitable.

A UEA policy of anonymous marking was introduced in September 2008, where practicable, for all coursework. Coursework that might not be anonymous, at the School's discretion, includes seminar presentations.

Word count penalty:

Up to 10% over the word limit - no penalty

10% or more over the word limit – a penalty will be applied.

See https://www.uea.ac.uk/learningandteaching/getting-started/handbooks for detailed information.

All assessed work should be typed, contain full bibliographic references and a word count. Students are required to keep electronic copies of all assignments for the duration of their degree.

Students must keep original coursework with comments attached and the electronic versions of all work submitted for the duration of their period of study. This is because if plagiarism is suspected, students may be asked to re-submit the electronic version of their coursework (including previous years) for screening. Failure to provide the electronic version could result in a mark of zero.

Failure to attend a seminar where you are one of the presenters will result in a mark of zero for the seminar presentation.

Section 8b – Assessment of module outcomes				
Learning Outcomes	**Formative Assessment 1**	**Summative Assessment 1**	**Summative Assessment 2**	**Exam**
List outcomes:				
1. Communicate, present and critically engage with issues around impact evaluation	**Yes**	**Yes**		**Yes**
2. Assess the quality of impact evaluations			**Yes**	**Yes**
3. Select and integrate information from various sources, e.g. electronic and print resources etc, to answer impact evaluation related questions	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**	**Yes**

All coursework is assessed according to the UEA Senate Scales criteria for PGT Coursework which can be found in your student handbook or via this link: https://portal.uea.ac.uk/learning-and-teaching/students/assessment/marking

I also added a copy of the Senate Scales on Blackboard.

For **assignment 1** the seven Senate Scales criteria will be interpreted as follows:

Senate Scale Criteria for PGT Coursework (University Wide):	**Marking Criteria** applied to this coursework
Learning outcomes & scholarship 15%	Does the assignment as a whole demonstrate the use and application of concepts discussed in the WED seminar 1? E.g. Has the Bamberger Framework been applied and acknowledged?

Argument & Understanding 20%	Have all areas of the task set been addressed precisely and fully?
Criticality & Analysis 20%	Critical discussion of the issues cropping up in the context of politics of evaluation using a case study example
Use of Sources & Evidence 15%	Did you select 3-5 sources, mostly academic journals, which informed your discussion in this report?
Written Communication 10%	The accuracy, clarity and style of written English in your report.
Academic Referencing 10%	All sources used must be referenced using the 'Harvard' system. In-text (author, year) citation must be done accurately. A well-formatted bibliography, giving all cited works in alphabetical order of author name and including all required information must be given at the end of the report.
Presentation 10%	Well-structured work: a clear introduction, logical sequencing of discussion, a conclusion which summarises the work done and draws together the main findings. Good use of paragraphs and sign-posting. Also includes typography, layout of work, format of tables and charts where applicable.

For **assignment 2** the seven Senate Scales criteria will be interpreted as follows:

Senate Scale Criteria for PGT Coursework (University Wide):	**Marking Criteria** applied to this coursework
Learning outcomes & scholarship 20%	Does the assignment as a whole demonstrate the use and application of concepts discussed in the lectures that link to the essay question that has been chosen?
Argument & Understanding 25%	Have all areas of the task set been addressed precisely and fully?
Criticality & Analysis 25%	Critical discussion of the issues emerging in the context of each essay question using a case study example where possible (or if required by the question)
Use of Sources & Evidence 10%	Did you select at least 7-9 sources, mostly academic journals, which informed your discussion in this assignment?

Written Communication 7%	The accuracy, clarity and style of written English in your report.
Academic Referencing 7%	All sources used must be referenced using the 'Harvard' system. In-text (author, year) citation must be done accurately. A well-formatted bibliography, giving all cited works in alphabetical order of author name and including all required information must be given at the end of the assignment.
Presentation 6%	Well-structured work: a clear introduction, logical sequencing of discussion, a conclusion which summarises the work done and draws together the main findings. Good use of paragraphs and sign-posting. Also includes typography, layout of work, format of tables and charts where applicable.

The coursework feedback sheet will include marker comments on each of these criteria.

In line with UEA policy, this coursework will be marked anonymously. Please make sure that your name does not appear anywhere on the submitted work. Your work should be identified by your registration number on the first page and if possible on all pages in either the footer or header.

Important: Submission Deadlines and Penalties for Late Submissions

Your attention is drawn to the penalties that apply for late submission. These are given in detail in your student handbook.

Section 9 – Employability

Impact Evaluation (IE) has become an important tool in development research and policy making, with multi and bilateral donor agencies and developing country governments widely committed to funding and utilising high quality IE evidence.

Policy makers and donor agencies are under increasing pressure to justify public spending on social and economic development programmes. It is recognised by numerous government authorities, non-governmental organisations, and academics that there is limited evidence on whether the resources spent on a particular programme actually achieve their designated goals, and whether they are cost-effective. This has encouraged initiatives to produce more rigorous policy and project evaluations and has resulted in the establishment of a number of institutions and initiatives, including training programmes, designed to improve social experiments and evaluation practices.

This course is designed for individuals who are interested in designing and implementing development projects and programmes and/or in researching development effectiveness, who need to develop and enhance their skills for undertaking high quality IE, as well as understanding its grounding in theory.